



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

by law or by the custom of the place.<sup>4</sup> To return to the general history of the subject, the tariff was first instituted in order to fix a *maximum*, beyond which people should not be bound to pay unless they liked; but the question came also to be decided, whether it did not fix a *minimum* as well; in other words, whether priests were at liberty to take less. It would seem that in some dioceses great dissatisfaction was felt by some priests with the highly unprofessional conduct of their poorer brethren, who undersold them by accepting a lower sum than that fixed by the tariff. Their conduct was looked on in the same light as in the present day the guinea physicians regard the proceedings of the advertising five shilling doctors. The priests complained to their Bishop, the Bishop wrote to the congregation at Rome, that the conduct of the priests who said Masses so cheap caused the sacrifice to be held cheap (*vilesce*) in the estimation of the people; and, on the 16th July, 1689, received a decree authorizing him not only to fix the tariff as he had done, but also to insist that no priest should accept less.

The stringency of the rule, "no money, no Mass," comes out also very strongly in a discussion of Pope Benedict as to a regulation which he is very anxious to see carried out, of having at least one Mass said for every dead person when the body is brought into the Church. But the practical puzzle is, how to carry out this regulation in the case of a pauper. He does suggest, indeed, that if due exertion were made there might, perhaps, be found in the parish some well-to-do priest benevolent enough to say the Mass gratis; but if not, he advises that the funds should be used for this purpose which are collected in the boxes in chapels; and he suggests, also, that, as many hospitals pay for the funeral expenses of the paupers who die there, the Mass might fairly be included among the legitimate funeral expenses.

Our limits warn us that we must draw to a close, else there are many other questions raised and decided on which we have not touched. For example, suppose that I have undertaken more Masses than I can conveniently fulfil in a moderate time, and that I get another priest to help me, promising to do as much for him another time. I fulfil my bargain. But, suppose that he receives but the bare tariff price for his Masses and I received twice as much for mine: am I bound to share?

Another question, whether, if one priest employs another to say Masses for him, he is bound to pay him in money or may do so in commodities, is worth mentioning, because the case actually arose a few years ago. The Abbé Migne, whose praiseworthy exertions in printing new editions of the fathers and other theological works are well known, being anxious to circulate his publications among the country clergy whose finances did not permit of their laying out large sums in adding to their libraries, devised the plan of instituting himself a Mass-factor as it were. He undertook to receive orders for Masses, to be executed by his country subscribers, and keeping the money himself to send them down the value in his books. The plan was laid with the best intentions, and without any view to filthy lucre; but it was ultimately abandoned as likely to be a bad precedent.

Another question that arises is, whether confessors may impose as penance on those who confess to them the procuring a certain number of Masses to be said; and it has been ruled that the penance is a very good one, provided it be not the confessor that is to say the Masses; otherwise it looks too like a judge imposing a fine which is to go into his own pocket.

But we must at length bring these illustrations to a close. Our readers will see that we have endeavoured candidly to give the higher authorities of the Roman Catholic Church all the credit they deserve, and have enumerated the regulations which they have made from time to time to curb the rapacity of avaricious priests. But it is evident that the error is in endeavouring to regulate and keep in order a practice which they ought to have abolished altogether. Considering that in the Roman Catholic Church, as in our own, Bishops are not allowed to ordain unless there be a nomination to some appointment, and that so no priest is dependant for his maintenance on saying Masses; there is no practical reason why they should not make for the whole Church the rule which Ignatius Loyola made for the order of the Jesuits—viz., that none of his priests should receive money for saying Masses.

As for the best of the rules, of which we have given specimens in this article, what do they read like, but rules for the regulation of a market; rules to prevent dishonesty, and to ensure the purchasers fair value for their money. But would any one recognise in them rules for the regulation of the highest act of Christian worship. We, Protestants, as we have Scripture authority for doing, set a high value on intercessory prayer, and believe that the prayer of Christians for one another is both acceptable in God's sight and corroborative of the faith and love of those who unite. But what should we think of a Christian who pro-

fessed to sell his prayers—to pray for those who paid him, and for those only? We should think that the prayers would be of little value of one so ignorant of the whole spirit of our religion. And can we think that conduct can be laudable in the clergy which we should consider disgraceful to the humblest layman, or that what cannot be permitted in the case of ordinary intercessory prayer may be tolerated in the very highest act of Christian devotion? It is possible that some of our Roman Catholic readers may think that in writing on this subject our article has deviated into a lighter strain than the sacredness of the subject demands; and we honestly confess that in studying regulations, of which money is the end and theme, we constantly found it hard to remember that we were studying anything more than the orders of a board of trade for the regulation of a market, to compel fraudulent merchants to fulfil their engagements,<sup>5</sup> and to prevent them from selling the same thing twice over. Can we be blamed if we have found it hard to remember, what the parties appear to have forgotten themselves, that the merchandise in which they trafficked was believed to be the very body and blood of our Saviour. We recommend it to the consideration of thoughtful Roman Catholics to reflect whether the theory and practice of their Church on this subject are consistent; and whether, supposing the doctrine of Transubstantiation to be true, it could be permissible to turn so awful a miracle into a mere source of revenue. And we think that the more they examine, the more inclined they will be to the opinion that money is at the root of the whole system; and that the torments of purgatory, and the power of Masses to allay them, would not have been so anxiously dilated on by the preachers of the middle ages if it were not that the money paid for these Masses formed an important part of the priestly revenues.

#### ST. CYPRIAN.

We have already given our readers so many extracts from the writings of St. Cyprian in our present volume<sup>6</sup> that but little more is necessary to complete the proof of the correctness of the summary which we gave<sup>7</sup> of his opinions on the subject of the Papal Supremacy. Living as he did in the middle of the third century, before, as Dr. Newman would say, the Papacy "awoke" or was "developed,"<sup>8</sup> it would be unreasonable to expect more pointed or direct repudiations of such supreme authority in the Bishops of Rome. The allusion to Pope Stephen's arrogance in the 3rd Council of Carthage (supra, p. 29), and his epistle to Pompeius (supra, p. 2), demonstrate how vigorously Cyprian would have opposed any more direct assumption of such an authority. It only remains to show that when Pope Stephen did venture to publish his abuse against St. Cyprian and expel him from communion with the Church at Rome, such attempted excommunication only recoiled against himself, and neither had the least effect in altering Cyprian's opinions or in inducing other Churches to exclude him from their communion. The learned Mosheim, in his Commentaries on the affairs of the Christians prior to the time of Constantine the Great, thus accurately states what was done by Pope Stephen, and guards his readers against misconception upon the subject:—(p. 535, &c.)

"Stephen, with a view of prevailing on his Eastern brethren to abandon this erroneous practice (i.e., re-baptizing heretics), addressed to them a letter, but the attempt proved ineffectual; and upon finding that they were not to be brought over to his opinion, but persisted in defending their own, he excluded them from all communion with himself and the Roman Church. Those who maintain that these Asiatic Christians, and afterwards their African brethren, were excommunicated by Stephen from the Church at large, labour under a mistake. The Bishop of Rome had not at this period assumed to himself such a degree of consequence as to fancy that he was invested with the power of excommunicating people from the Church at large, neither did any of those whom he excluded from communion with his own individual Church conceive that they were thereby put entirely without the Christian pale. Opinions like these were the offspring of a much more recent period. Every Bishop, it is true, was, at the time of which we are speaking, at liberty to exclude from his own communion, and pronounce unworthy of fraternal association, any person whom he might judge, whether truly or mistakenly mattered not, to be contaminated by any very grievous error, or to have acted in any way inconsistent with the duty of a Christian teacher. But his judgment, in this respect, was not imperative or binding on others, every one being at liberty to use his own will in either following or rejecting it. This was the rule by which Cyprian acted, and by which Victor and Stephen,

successively Bishops of Rome, and the greater part of the other prelates of this period, acted. Those, therefore, who apply the term *excommunication* to this sort of private judgments or decrees, and, for example, represent Cyprian as having been *excommunicated* by Stephen, are guilty of a most egregious mistake, since there is certainly a most material difference between a Bishop excommunicating any one and merely excluding him from his own communion."

While, however, the extent of the excommunication of the Asiatic Bishops, and afterwards of Cyprian and the Africans, was very far from having the effect or extent of an interdict or excommunication in the Hildebrandic age of the full-grown Papacy, there can be no doubt whatever that Stephen, Bishop of Rome, did all in his power to anathematize and excommunicate both the Asiatics and Africans, because they differed from him in this point of ecclesiastical discipline.

We learn from the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius that this was the case, in the following passage of his 7th book:—"Dionysius of Alexandria, in writing to Pope Sixtus (or Xystus), Stephen's successor, on baptism, at the same time showing the opinion and decision passed by Stephen and the rest of the Bishops, makes the following remarks on Stephen:—'He had written before respecting Helenus and Firmilianus, and all those from Cilicia and Cappadocia and Galatia, and all the nations adjoining, that he would not have communion with them on this account, because they, said he, re-baptized the heretics.' And, behold, I pray you, the importance of the matter. For, in reality, as I have ascertained, decrees have been passed in the greatest Councils of the Bishops, that those who come from the heretics are first to be instructed, and then are to be washed and purified from the filth of their old and impure leaven. And respecting all these things, I have sent letters entreating them."<sup>9</sup>

The celebrated letter of Firmilian, which we have already given some extracts from (p. 2, supra), affords still more striking proofs of Pope Stephen's violence and want of charity. Firmilian was Bishop of Caesarea, in Cappadocia (a predecessor of St. Basil the Great, whose opinions a century after we discussed in our last number), and one of the most eminent prelates of his age, as is several times expressly stated by the historian Eusebius.<sup>10</sup>

Firmilian and his colleagues in the East had, at a Council held at Iconium, decided for themselves the question of re-baptizing heretics, as he tells Cyprian distinctly in this letter, and as Dionysius of Alexandria also wrote to Philemon, as we learn also from Eusebius. "But," says Firmilian,<sup>11</sup> "as a doubt was started concerning the baptism of those who, though they joined with the new prophets, yet seemed to acknowledge the same Father and Son with us, we assembled in considerable numbers at Iconium, and there we disputed this question at large, and upon the result of all we confirmed the opinion, that all baptisms were to be rejected which were celebrated out of the Church."

Dionysius of Alexandria, in his third epistle on baptism to Philemon, a presbyter of Rome, while he admits that he had received a contrary rule and form from the Blessed Pope (Papa) Heraclius, his predecessor in the See of Alexandria, goes on as follows:—"I have also understood, not only that this practice (i.e., re-baptism of heretics) was introduced by them of Africa, but that long since, during the times of those Bishops before us, in the most populous Churches, the same thing was decreed by the Councils of the brethren at Iconium and Synada.<sup>12</sup> To overturn their determinations, and to drive them into contention and strife, I cannot endure, &c."<sup>13</sup>

Firmilian's letter shows also that St. Cyprian and his colleagues had sent a special messenger, named Rogatian, to Cappadocia, in order to secure the sympathy of their Asiatic brethren, and had also sent special legates to Rome to endeavour to appease the rage of Stephen; but the latter only made matters worse.

Mosheim thus describes what happened:—

"The African Prelates conceived that no means ought to be left untried on their part to quiet the storm that had been raised, and they accordingly despatched a legation to Rome for the purpose of restoring things, if possible, to their former state. Orders were, however, issued by Stephen that the Bishops charged with this mission should not be received by any of the members of the Roman Church into their houses, inasmuch as they were to be regarded in the light of heretics, whom he had

<sup>4</sup> Valerius, in his notes on Eusebius, p. 141, wishes to give a milder interpretation to this, under the idea that Stephen never actually broke off connection with the Asiatics, but merely threatened to do so. But Firmilian's epistle to Cyprian puts the matter beyond controversy, in which he never once bestows on Stephen the title of "brother," but treats him as an open adversary and an enemy. Towards the end of this epistle, he states in the plainest terms that it was not only against the African Prelates that Stephen had declared war, but that he had previously broken communion with many other Churches, and in particular those in the eastern parts. "Pacem cum singulis vario discordie genere ruptentem, modo cum orientaliis quod nec vos latere confidimus, modo vobiscum qui in meridie estis, p. 355. Quod nunc, Stephanus ausus est facere, ruptens adversus vos pacem, quam semper antecessores ejus vobiscum amore et honore mutuo custodierunt."—Cyprian, Op. p. 344, Ben. Ed., Venet., 1758.

<sup>5</sup> Eusebius, lib. vii., ch. 5.

<sup>6</sup> Eusebius, Ecc. Hist., lib. vi., ch. 26-46, and lib. vii., cc. 5, 28, 30.

<sup>7</sup> Cyprian, Opera, Ben. Ed., Epist. 75, p. 353.

<sup>8</sup> Iconium was a town of Lycania, now *Konia*; Synada, a city of Phrygia-Major, famous for its marble.

<sup>9</sup> Eusebius, lib. vii., ch. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Not always that; for we read that in the year 1723 the Augustine monks, Dominicans, Carmelites, and others, being involved in inextricable debt, in consequence of obligations to perpetual Masses which they had contracted, Pope Innocent XIII. applied the sponge, and discharged all their arrears on condition of their saying one grand Mass annually for all their creditors.—See a memorial bearing date 28th Sept., 1763, pp. 15, 17, 20, cited from the Venetian state papers by De Potter, *Histoire du Christianisme*, vol. v., p. 297.

This is in conformity with the Canon of the Council of Trent, sess. xxv., cap. iv., which provides, that when an institution is burdened with more Masses than it can fulfil, the Bishop shall arrange the matter according to his discretion, provided that a commemoration of the benefactor shall always be made. This, if we understand it right, is equivalent to giving the benefactor a fractional part of a Mass instead of the whole, which he had calculated on.

<sup>11</sup> See supra, pp. 1, 29, 34, 111.

<sup>12</sup> Supra, p. 94.

<sup>13</sup> Supra, p. 123, note \*.

\* Helmstad, 1753.

<sup>14</sup> De Eucharistia—"Quamquam Sacerdotes accipere possint quicquid a fidelibus pro elemosina Missarum libere offertur, non presumant tamen ex gere ultra quod a lege vel consuetudine legitima in singulis Diocesis statuitur."—Acta et Decreta Concilii Provincie Castellensis. Duobus, 1854, p. 67-8. We find nothing on this subject either in the decrees of the Provincial Council of Dublin, held under Dr. Cullen, in June, 1853, or in those of the Synod of Thurles, in 1850. Published by James Duffy, Wellington-quay, 1851. Jussu Superiorum.

excluded from his communion, and considered as unworthy of being honoured with a conference.")

He then quotes Firmilian, whose letter, couched in terms of the most cutting irony (of all figures of speech the one least compatible with respect), proceeds as follows:—"Thus, whilst you (Stephen) think it in your power to excommunicate all the world, you have only separated yourself from the communion of the whole Christian Church; nor had the precepts even of an Apostle sufficient weight with you to keep you within the rules of truth and peace, though he hath recorded for your use the following exhortation, 'I, therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that you walk worthy of the vocation wherewith you are called: with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace' (Ephesians iv. 1, &c.). With what exactness, now, and diligence, hath Stephen observed these salutary directions of the Apostle, especially in the first article thereof, concerning *lowliness and meekness*? For what could be more meek and lowly than his discord with so many Bishops all over the Christian world? Then, his breach of the peace in divers manners, now with his Eastern colleagues (wherewith we suppose you are by this time acquainted), and then with you in the South, from whom he received legates with great long-suffering and meekness, indeed! When he could not admit them to discourse a word with him even in common conversation; and when, in his great and deep regard to the rules of love and charity! he directed all the members of his Church not to receive them into their houses, nor to afford them the common civilities due to strangers! This, forsooth, is keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, to cut himself off from that unity which the law of charity would have obliged him to maintain," &c., &c.

Mosheim then proceeds:—

"The African legates were, therefore, obliged to return home without having accomplished their errand. By what other act than this it could have been rendered more clearly apparent that it was not merely Cyprian, but the whole African Church, whose representatives these Bishops were, that Stephen excluded from all communion with the Roman Church, I cannot possibly conceive"—p. 556.

Unfortunately, the letter addressed by Stephen to Firmilian is not extant—not improbably, as Mosheim suspects, put out of the way or destroyed by unscrupulous adherents of Rome, who wished to conceal the impotent arrogance of Stephen, as Manutius (or rather Cardinal Borromeo, his superior in the matter), attempted to suppress this very epistle of Firmilian to Cyprian by omitting it in the Roman Edition of 1564, "because of what he describes as his abhorrence of the *peritess and petulance* of its writer" towards the Bishop of Rome; in other words, because every line of it proved that neither the Asiatic or African Churches acknowledged either the infallibility or supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

We cannot doubt, however, that Firmilian gives us Stephen's own words when he says, near the close of the letter in question, "Yet is Stephen not ashamed of dividing his brethren in aid and support of heretics; nay, nor of calling Cyprian '*false Christ, false prophet, and deceitful workman*,' all of which characters, his own conscience telling him, were deserved by himself; he hath first drawn out their lineaments, and by ascribing them falsely to another person hath put us in mind that he was himself the true original, with whom they best suited."

It was after all this, but, probably, before Cyprian had actually received Firmilian's letter (or he, no doubt, would have read it at the Council), that Cyprian convened the 3rd Council of Carthage, at which 87 Bishops attended, and at which Cyprian made the memorable address which we have already given (in page 29, supra; and which is well worth a rehearsal), and all the proceedings at which are recorded at large in Cyprian's works, the earliest record extant, we believe, of the details of any Christian synod (see Ben. Ed., p. 697).

Having thus shown that St. Cyprian was engaged in a systematic, studied, and even bitter opposition to the judgment of a Roman Prelate and the customs of the Church of Rome—an opposition in which he persisted in spite of the most cogent reasons that Rome could command, and the most powerful denunciations and penalties which Rome could utter or enforce, we now proceed to inquire what is the evidence that he ever retracted his opinions, or was re-admitted before his death into communion with the Church of Rome. The candid and learned Dupin admits that he never did retract or succumb to Rome. "Be this as it may," says Dupin (Eccl. Hist., vol. i, p. 118), "it is certain that St. Cyprian never altered his opinion, and the Greek Churches were long divided upon this question." The onus of proof certainly rests on those who would account for his now being admitted into the canon of the Mass as a Saint, by alleging, in spite of all probability, that he did recant before his martyrdom. Without strong evidence that he did so, the improbability of it would be, with any impartial and

candid mind, decisive against such an assertion. But two years elapsed between Cyprian's most decisive act of opposition, when presiding at the third Council of Carthage, in Sept., A.D. 256, to which we have referred, and his martyrdom, which occurred in Sept., 258. Within that period he wrote many epistles, in none of which he makes any mention whatever of such a change of opinion. That he should, in so short a time, have changed an opinion taken up so warmly, and maintained so pertinaciously; supported, also, by the synods of Iconium and Synada in the East, and the decided support and cordial sympathy of his able friend the Bishop of Cæsarea, to say nothing of the concurrence of the 87 Bishops in the Council of Carthage, is most improbable, and the evidences of his conversion, if it had ever taken place, would have been so valuable to the Church, that it is in the highest degree improbable that, if they ever existed, they would have been suffered to perish. What, however, appears conclusive of the negative is, that no such evidence existed in the time of St. Augustine, who was himself a prelate in the same country, Africa, within little more than 100 years afterwards. St. Augustine, as we have shown in another page, was born in Numidia, A.D. 354, and was Bishop of Hippo, in Africa, from A.D. 395 to 430, while the memory of Cyprian was still held in the greatest veneration. He was warmly engaged in controversy with the Donatists, who boasted much of the authority of Cyprian as an advocate for their opinions concerning baptism. If Cyprian ever retracted his opinions on that subject and conformed to those of Rome, it seems to be impossible that his fellow-countryman, St. Augustine, should not have known of that recantation; yet that he did not is beyond a doubt, for he expressly says so in more than one passage of his works; nay, he uses his utmost ingenuity in conjectures where he failed in knowledge—conjectures, indeed, of the most improbable character, where he could not have failed in knowledge, if the fact had been so; for never was any man in more favourable circumstances for collecting evidence of the fact, or under stronger impulses to urge him to acquire it, if there had been any trace whatever of the existence of such a recantation. As to the suggestion that the Donatists had suppressed and destroyed the evidence between the date of Cyprian's martyrdom and the time of St. Augustine, it would be to believe that they were the dominant, instead of the heterodox and defeated party, contrary to the whole testimony of ecclesiastical history, and without the faintest colour of foundation or even probability.

The following are some out of many of the passages in St. Augustine's writings, bearing on the question now under consideration.

In his epistle to Vincentius, Bishop of Cartens, he says—"We find that Cyprian held an opinion concerning baptism differing from the rule and custom of the Church; but we find not that he corrected that opinion; but of so great a man it is not incongruous to suppose that he did correct it, and it may, perhaps, have been suppressed by those who were well pleased with his error, and were unwilling to do without the authority of his concurrence."

Can any one believe that if St. Augustine could have found the slightest trace of a rumour or tradition on the subject, that he would not have stated and relied on it, instead of putting forward two mere conjectures of his own, first, that Cyprian *might* have changed his views; and, secondly, the evidence of his having done so *might* have been suppressed; after the frank admission previously made, that "we don't find that he corrected it."

We shall only trouble our readers with one other passage equally decisive. In his treatise on baptism, written expressly against the Donatists, Augustine thus writes:—"Through the confession of martyrdom, he (Cyprian) ascended to the light of angels, so that *whether or not before*, yet *there* he certainly knows, with the assurance of revelation, the truth of the contrary of his opinion."

What a proof that St. Augustine was unable to assert, with the slightest colour of foundation, that St. Cyprian had changed his opinions on earth, when he says that *at least in Heaven* he now knows his error!

We, too, believe that St. Cyprian is now in Heaven, where neither sin nor error of any kind can enter. And here we must now leave him, reluctantly closing our review of the works and opinions of this most eminent man, who was, at the same time, one of the earliest and most independent of the ancient Fathers of the Church, and one whose writings, when duly weighed and understood, render him one of the most decisive witnesses against the theory that the See of Rome had, by divine institution, a supreme power

to regulate the faith and practice of universal Christendom. There, doubtless, are many passages in his earlier writings which show that he thought the See of Peter was a *type* of unity; but none that he thought the Church of Rome the *bond* or *instrument* of unity, much less the *ruling power* by which Christ intended unity to be perpetuated. We have proved that Cyprian taught the equal right of Bishops, and denied both expressly and by implication that the Bishop of Rome had any authority for compelling other Bishops to follow his opinions. Cyprian, making allowance for certain opinions in which he was not ultimately followed by the Church at large, may be safely taken as the representative of early traditions as to the relative positions of the see of Rome and other bishoprics; and, if so, there is no foundation for the claim of Papal supremacy in *tradition* any more than in the Scriptures. Therefore, if it be true that neither Scripture nor the earliest traditions support the claims of Rome to the universal authority and domination she now claims, we may come to the fearless conclusion that **ROME IS NOT, EXCEPT BY USURPATION, THE MOTHER AND MISTRESS OF ALL CHURCHES.**"

### THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

In concluding our pages on the question of the Supremacy, we intended to have endeavoured to show *how* it was that, without any solid foundation in either Scripture or early tradition, the Bishops of Rome ultimately attained to that vast power which reached its climax in the time of Pope Gregory VII., the notorious Hildebrand, towards the close of the 11th century. We have, however, from time to time so far anticipated this part of our subject, that probably anything we can say now may be considered but a repetition or expansion of what has already sufficiently appeared in our pages.

When, indeed, we consider (to use the words of a writer already referred to) "how many necessary elements of greatness and influence must have coincided in the Roman Pontiff and his Church, we rather wonder that the domination of that See did not sooner assume its ultimate form and extent. Rome was the place of concourse, the centre of wealth, the fountain of honour, the school of literature, the mould of fashion, the court, the palace, the emporium of the whole western world; and the Church of Rome was, probably, at least as large a portion of the population, and sometimes even of the influence of that vast city, that heart of the world, as it was of any other place. The clergy of Rome would become necessarily the centre of communication to the whole Church; they would exceed all others in learning, and in whatever influence arises from accidental circumstances, and hence they *must* have acquired very great importance throughout the whole western world; their favour and recognition would be a passport to the confidence of a thousand Churches; and to be condemned by them would be to be cut off from the respect of all who took from them their tone of thought and feeling. For a while there was a high spirit of ecclesiastical principle counteracting in the Christian Church this influence, else it had not been so long in attaining its full strength; but nature at last prevailed; what we might have anticipated almost certainly, took place, and Rome became the *mistress* of the Church. Had she proved their *mother* also, and not their *step-mother*, she might never have had to lament the loss of so large a portion of the household of faith."

There is still, however, much to say on what we may call the *philosophy* of this great phenomenon; but we find it so admirably treated of already by the eminent writer whom we have so often referred to, Dr. Isaac Barrow, that we think it much better to give our readers a part, at least, of what he says upon the subject in his own forcible, though quaint language, than attempt anything of our own, which must be much less effective; and we hope the sample we are about to give our readers will induce them to read the whole of his argument in the original work for themselves.

The passages we cite are taken verbatim from the celebrated work of Dr. Barrow on the Supremacy, which, in our judgment, is, perhaps, the most complete treatise upon any theological subject extant in any language.

"Having showed," says he, "at large that this universal sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome over the Christian Church hath no real foundation, either in Scripture or elsewhere, it will be requisite to show by what ways and means so groundless a claim and pretence should gain belief and submission to it, from so considerable a part of Christendom; and that from so very slender roots (from slight beginnings, and the slimmest pretences one can well imagine) this bulk of exorbitant power did grow the vastest that ever man on earth did attain, or did ever aim at, will be the less wonderful, if we do consider the many causes which did concur and contribute thereto, some whereof are proposed in the following observations.

"1. Eminency of any kind (in wealth, in honour, in reputation, in might, in place, or mere order of dignity, doth easily pass into advantages of real power and command

† Commentary, p. 544; also Dupin Eccl. Hist., vol. i, p. 117.

‡ There are several other passages in Firmilian's letter which are well worthy of notice, and which we sincerely regret being unable to give our readers, from want of space; see especially p. 351.

1 "Cyprianus autem sensissimè aliter de baptismo, quam forma et consuetudo habebat Ecclesie, non in canonicis, sed in suis et concilii literis invenitur; correxisse autem istam sententiam non invenitur; non incongruentem tamen de tali viro existimandum est quod correxerit, et fortasse suppressum sit ab eis, qui hoc errore nimium delectati sunt, et tanto veluti patricio carere noluerunt.—Ad. Vinc. Rogat., Ep. xciii., tom. ii., p. 246, Ben. Ed.

2 Per martyrii confessionem pervenit ad angelicam lucem; ut si non antea, ibi certe revelatum agnosceret, quod cum aliter asperet sententiam diversæ opinionis vinculo non præposuit unitatis.—De Baptismo, contr. Donat., lib. ii., cap. v. tom. ix., p. 99, Ben. Ed.

3 Optatus, also, it will be recollected, wrote against the Donatists, and his omission also to mention Cyprian's recantation is equally strong, that no such recantation was ever made or heard of. Optatus, it will be recollected, was also an African, and Bishop of Milvius, in Numidia, about the year 370, and could not have failed to have heard of and noticed it, had there been the faintest ground for supposing that St. Cyprian ever changed his opinions.

4 We recommend to our readers, who have not leisure to read the original, and who wish for further information about Cyprian and his writings, "The Life and Times of St. Cyprian," by Rev. Geo. Ayliffe Poole, M.A., published at Oxford by J. H. Parker, 1840; "The Testimony of St. Cyprian against Rome," by the same author, published by James Duncan, London, 1838; and a spirited translation of all the genuine works of St. Cyprian, by Rev. Nath. Marshall, London, 1717.

5 Rev. George Ayliffe Poole's Testimony of St. Cyprian, p. 151.